

## REMARKS

Claims 17-31 are pending in this application, with claim 17 being in independent form. Claims 17, 22, and 30 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention; these changes are for the purposes of clarification only, and no change in scope of the claims is either intended or believed to be effected by the changes.


Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's comment at page 2 of the Office Action that the "cited prior art of record does not teach or suggest the instantly claimed combination of process steps nor what appears to be the intended combination of components of the instantly claimed system."

Claims 17-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, for the reasons provided at page 2 of the Office Action. The claims have been carefully reviewed and amended as deemed necessary to ensure that they conform fully to the requirements of Section 112, second paragraph, with special attention to the points raised in the Office Action. It is believed that the rejections under Section 112, second paragraph, have been obviated, and their withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 were provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of copending Application No. 10/531,799. Cancellation of claims 1-16 render this rejection moot; Applicant does not concede the propriety of the rejection.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully Submitted



---

John Richards  
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP  
26 West 61<sup>st</sup> Street  
New York, New York 10023  
Reg. No. 31,053  
Tel. No. (212) 708-1915